

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are now present in this application.

The specification and claim 1 have been amended and claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by YANKER, U.S. Patent 5,249,363. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over YANKER in view of CLARK et al., U.S. Patent 5,995,101. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over YANKER in view of AUDO et al., U.S. Patent 6,587,123. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

U.S. Patent 5,249,363 to YANKER

The Examiner asserts that YANKER teaches storing an object and function in the system, outputting a preview generated by applying the function to the object when the pointer is moved onto the icon ("subroutine tests whether cursor 54 has been moved to a new color block", see col. 8, lines 14-15 of YANKER). It is noted that YANKER teaches color changing but not applying a function to an object. That is, from the technological point of view, color

changing does not involve applying an effect to an object. Additionally, the subroutine disclosed in YANKER is to change a target color from a present one to another displayed palette color, whereas the applying function disclosed in the present application is an effect applied to the object, such as edging or brushing effects for images. Color changing alone cannot be interpreted as applying an effect to an object. That is, YANKER does not teach outputting a preview generated by applying the function to the object when the pointer is moved onto the icon.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner.

U.S. Patent 5,995,101 to CLARK

The Examiner admits that YANKER fails to show the period of time the cursor is positioned over the icon required to activate the preview, as is disclosed in claim 10. The Examiner then asserts that CLARK teaches an audio-visual editing system similar to that of YANKER and teaches a preview (tool tip) to be outputted when a pointer is moved onto an icon for a period of time. It is respectfully submitted that CLARK discloses a graphical user interface including an information element that provides information in the graphical display when a user points to the area

of interest. That is, CLARK teaches showing the corresponding information according to the area pointed by users. CLARK mentions nothing about replacing an object or applying an effect to an object in a display. Thus, YANKER and CLARK belong to distinct technological fields. There is no motivation or hint for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the technology provided in YANKER and CLARK.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner.

U.S. Patent 6,587,123 to AUDO et al.

The Examiner admits that YANKER fails to show the details of preview editing for sound, as is disclosed in claim 5 of the present application. The Examiner also admits that YANKER fails to show the function applied to be sound effect, as is disclosed in claim 9. The Examiner then asserts that AUDO et al. teaches the object being a sound ("audio materials", see col. 7, line 33, of AUDO et al.) and to have functions that apply a sound effect to the object. It is respectfully submitted that AUDO et al. provides a video material selecting apparatus. The video selecting apparatus provided by AUDO et al. can select and edit video or audio materials from a plurality of stored materials. Thus, the technological fields of YANKER and AUDO et al. are different. There is no motivation or hint for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the technology provided in YANKER and AUDO et al. Additionally, the executing steps provided in

YANKER and AUDO et al. Additionally, the executing steps provided in AUDO et al. cannot be combined into those provided in YANKER.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 9 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Joe McKinney Muncy
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

KM/asc
0941-0299P

(Rev. 02/12/2004)